



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/902,066

07/10/2001

Joseph Weinberger

118-004F

1252

26633

7590

03/03/2006

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP
1717 RHODE ISLAND AVE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3001

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/902,066	Applicant(s) WEINBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner King Y. Poon	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-20 and 25-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-20 and 25-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/1/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 16-20, 25-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. Regarding claims 16, 32, 36: The limitations of the "the computer controller is configured to: receive a copier machine control command from the personal computer; and transmit to the personal computer via the interface/chip a copier machine status information in response to a request for status information received from the personal computer" are subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way

as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The examiner does not found a computer controller that received a copier control command from the personal computer in the disclosure to be combined with other limitations of the claims.

The examiner is requesting the applicant to provide support for the claimed limitations of : 1) the computer controller 2) personal computer 3) interface (claim 32) and chip (claim 16) and 4) the functional limitations between them as being claimed.

Claims 17-20, 25-31, 33-35, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph because they depend on rejected claims 16, 32, 36.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 32-35, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 32 recites the limitation "the computer controller is configured to: receive a copier machine control command from the personal computer; and transmit to the personal computer via the interface a copier machine status information in response to a request for status information received from the personal computer." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear the personal

Art Unit: 2625

compute is referring to the remote computer as claimed in lines 2, 6 or a different computer which is a personal computer.

Claims 33-35, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph because they depend on rejected claim 32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 16, 17, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222), Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and Stephens et al (US 4,644,478).

Regarding claim 16: Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38) comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) capable of being monitored by a computer (computer, column 9, lines 14-40) from a remote location, the copier comprising a control computer (16, fig. 1) controlling the performance of the copier (diagnostic data, column 9, column 8, lines 42-65), and a control panel (the display and its control circuit, column 8, lines 35-42) that configured to receive data from the control computer; an interface circuit (column 8, lines 42-69) corresponding to the copier, the an interface circuit providing an interface (the part that functions like 20, fig. 1) for

Art Unit: 2625

connecting the copier with a bi-directional (inherent properties of an local area network, column 8, lines 25-26) network, said bi-directional network being capable of connecting the computer to a plurality of devices (fig. 2, column 16, lines 30-38), and a memory device corresponding to the copier, the memory device (the memory of fig. 1 that store status information such as a paper count, column 7, lines 50-65, and the id code, column 6, lines 62-65) storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network , wherein said an interface circuit transmits the special information to the personal computer and identifies the copier remotely in the network and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51, column 6, lines 55-69), and the control computer is configured to: receive a copier control command (column 9, lines 20-30); and transmit via the interface circuit to the computer a copier status information in response to request for status information received from the computer (column 9, lines 23-30).

Although Kravette teaches the interface can be programmed (column 8, lines 40-45), and it is well known in the art that a processor can be programmed, Kravette does not specifically states that the interface circuit that can be programmed is a processor.

However, column 14, lines 50-60, teaches the interface used for translating diagnostic information to be sent to the monitoring computer is a processor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to use a processor for the interface (12, fig. 1) disclosed in column 8, lines 40-45.

Art Unit: 2625

Kravette does not teach the computer is a personal computer.

Stephen, in the same area of computer, teaches the type of computer comprises personal computer which function can be programmed for specific application such as monitoring. (column 3, lines 20-35)

Since Kravette teaches to use a computer for the monitoring the copier and it is well known in the art that all computers can be programmed to perform a specific function, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using a personal computer as the monitoring computer, as taught by Stephen, because a personal computer is cheap, light, more variety and can be purchase from every computer stores.

Kravette does not teach the circuit is a chip/integrated circuit.

Hepworth, in the same area of interface circuit, teaches interface circuit and microprocessors can be putted in a chip (abstract, column1, lines 40-69, column 2, lines 5-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: putting the circuit/processor onto a chip.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette by the teaching of Hepworth because of the following reasons (a) a chip is small and light; and (b) a chip is cheap, Hepworth, column 2, lines 5-10.

Kravette also does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

Regarding claim 17: Hepworth teaches that it is well known in the art that an interface chip has first circuitry for converting serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converting parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data, and second circuitry for driving a pair of signal lines according to the converted serial data, the first and second circuitry being incorporated in the chip (column 1, lines 55-69).

Regarding claim 38: Kravette teaches wherein the control computer is configured to transmit real time copier status information to the remote computer (column 6, lines 15-40).

9. Claims 18-20, 25, 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222),

Art Unit: 2625

Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and Stephens et al (US 4,644,478) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Biffle et al (US 4,625,077).

Regarding claim 18: Kravette teaches the system comprises a telephone network (fig. 2).

Inherently a telephone network comprises a plurality of lines/phone numbers, Biffle teaches each of the plurality of phone lines having at least a pair (column 6, lines 35-40) of signal lines transmitting asynchronous serial data (column 9, lines 9-15, Kravette, column 2, lines 19-25, Hepworth).

Regarding claim 19: Kravette teaches wherein the plurality of lines comprises four signal lines (a phone network has at least four signal lines/four pair of twist pair) having the pair of signal lines.

Regarding claim 20: Kravette teaches wherein the pair of signal comprise a hard wiring (twisted pair are hard wiring).

Regarding claim 25: Kravette teaches wherein the chip is a microprocessor (CPU of 102, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 27: Kravette teaches wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters (column 11, lines 53-60), a copy count (column 6, lines 45-50), and error code (column 13, lines 55-60, column 14, lines 60-65) are displayed on a display screen (column 7, lines 39-52) of the personal computer.

Regarding claim 28: Kravette wherein the control panel comprises a light emitting diode (column 4, lines 38-42).

Regarding claim 29: Kravette wherein the control panel comprises a liquid crystal display (column 4, lines 38-42).

Regarding claim 30: Kravette teaches wherein the control panel comprises a plurality of keys (column 9, lines 40-45)

Regarding claim 31: Kravette teaches wherein an error status signal is sent from the control computer to the control panel (column 9, lines 40-55).

10. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222), Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) Stephens et al (US 4,644,478) and Biffle et al (US 4,625,077) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Ladewski et al (US 4,531,215).

Regarding claim 26: Kravette does not teach that the CPU is connected to an address decoder.

However, Ladewski, in the same area of CPU, teaches it is well known in the art to connect a CPU with an address decoder (20, fig. 1) such that the CPU can access other devices (column 2, lines 50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: CPU is connected to an address decoder such that the CPU can access the RAM or other units.

Art Unit: 2625

11. Claims 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of Stephens et al (US 4,644,478), Godsey (US 4,181,941) and McCracken (RE. 31222).

Regarding claim 36: Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38 comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) machine, a memory device (the memory that stored copier ID, column 11, lines 50-60, column 6, lines 60-65 used by the copier to identify itself, column 6, lines 62-65) corresponding to the copier, the memory storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier, and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51); a communication circuit (12, fig. 1) and a driver circuit (14, fig. 1) capable of transmitting serial data stream over the bidirectional communication line, wherein the copier is configured to: receive a copier control command from the computer; and transmit via the network to the computer a copier status information in response to a request for status information received from the computer (column 9, lines 20-30).

Kravette does not teach the computer is a personal computer.

Stephen, in the same area of computer, teaches the type of computer comprises personal computer which function can be programmed for specific application such as monitoring (column 3, lines 20-35).

Since Kravette teaches to use a computer for the monitoring the copier and it is well known in the art that all computers can be programmed to perform a specific

Art Unit: 2625

function, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using a personal computer as the monitoring computer, as taught by Stephen, because a personal computer is cheap, light, more variety and can be purchase from every computer stores.

Kravette does not teach a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the special information to the personal computer through the network, the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data used by said copier into serial data to be placed on the pair of wires.

Godsey, in the same area of transmitting signal using modem and telephone line teaches that it is well known in the art to use a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the signal over telephone line with modem by using the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data into serial data (column 4, lines 22-30) to be placed on the pair of wires (inherent properties of phone wire).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the special information to the personal computer through the network, the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data used by said copier into serial data to be placed on the pair of wires.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette by the teaching of Godsey such that communication over phone line using a modem is possible for the system of Kravette.

Kravette also does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

Regarding claim 37: Kravette teaches wherein the status of the copier machine monitored by the remote computer comprises a setup parameter of the copier (column 11, lines 53-60, column 13, lines 55-60, column 14, lines 60-65) of the copier, and wherein data representing the setup parameter is transmitted via the interface to the remote computer in a format enabling a representation of the data to be displayed on a display screen (column 7, lines 39-52) of the remote computer.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2625

With respect to applicant's argument that Kravette does not teach a copier to receive a copier control command from the monitoring computer and to transmit the monitoring computer a copier status information in response to a request for status information received from the monitoring (personal computer) has been considered.

In reply: Column 9, lines 20-30, Kravette teaches a CPU 24 receives a copier control command (status request signal) from the monitoring computer (computer at the central station) and to transmit the monitoring computer a copier status information in response to a request for status information received from the monitoring (personal computer).

Column 15, lines 15-25, Kravette teaches CPU 24 is part of the copier.

Therefore, Kravette teaches a copier to receive a copier control command from the monitoring computer and to transmit the monitoring computer a copier status information in response to a request for status information received from the monitoring computer (personal computer, also see office action).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Elzind (US 5,585,704) teaches non-volatile memory is memory that save information in the case the power to the memory is removed (column 2, lines 39-41).


Edward et al. (US 3,558,912) teaches non-volatile means that information is preserved in the case the power, to the circuit that stores the information, is removed (column 1, lines 35-40).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 25, 2006



KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER